



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/005,874	12/04/2001	Takehiro Onomatsu	04995/043001	7962
22511 7	590 11/26/2004		EXAM	INER .
OSHA & MAY L.L.P. 1221 MCKINNEY STREET			KOSTAK, VICTOR R	
HOUSTON, TX 77010			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			2614	

DATE MAILED: 11/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/005,874	ONOMATSU, TAKEHIRO				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Victor R. Kostak	2614				
The MAILING DATE of this communicate Period for Reply	tion appears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) de - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statuto - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TION. 7 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a resation. ays, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty ry period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT by statute, cause the application to become ABA	eply be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. FHS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed of	on <u>19 August 2004</u> .					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b)	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
•	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 6-11 is/are pending in the apple 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are versions. 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 6-11 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction.	vithdrawn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the E						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)						
Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	` '				
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by		, ,				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority doc	cuments have been received. cuments have been received in Ap he priority documents have been a Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Su	ummary (PTO-413)				
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO Paper No(s)/Mail Date 		/Mail Date · formal Patent Application (PTO-152) 				

Art Unit: 2614

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 9 introduces a method for generating a channel map, but there are no steps in the claim involving generation of a channel map. At most there is a method of *modifying*, or more specifically *redacting*, a channel *table* because only deletion of channels from a table is recited.

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

New claims 6-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. in view of Eyer (of record).

The system of Kim (noting Fig. 3) involves receiving both analog and digital programming (noting respective tuners 1 and 2), and an EEPROM 6 for storing a virtual channel table of analog and digital channels. Kim detects the state of reception of a digital TV channel (col. 5 lines 43-48) and deletes analog and digital channels from the list (analog channels discussed in col. 4 lines 52-55; digital channels in col. 5 lines 43-48).

Applicant is informed that in the two "wherein" clauses, the subject matter recited therein is not considered as comprising any steps since they are drafted in the passive tense (i.e. channel

Art Unit: 2614

"is deleted") which according to the following listed Court decisions. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Applicant is informed that claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd.* v. *Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966). Claim 9, however, is definite because it does contain some steps in the active tense, but these steps recited therein are not.

Back to the considered claim language, digital broadcasting includes minor channels as well as the standard major ("integer") channels used in analog broadcasting. In view of the fact acknowledged by Eyer presented in the last Office action, the same programming can be provided and therefore received in both analog and digital formats, and having the same TSIDs (col. 5 lines 45-50 of Eyer), it would have been obvious to have the receiver of Kim capable of receiving those same programs in analog and digital format for the benefit of allowing the user to receive as large a variety of programming, such being a primary consideration of broadcasting. As a result, it would accordingly have been obvious to delete one of the analog and/or digital channel having a common channel, so enabled by Kim, thereby meeting claim 9

As for claim 6 (which contains language similar to that of claim 9 that was not addressed), as Eyer mentions and as was pointed out in the last Office action, digital services are generally considered and superior to analog (col. 5 lines 45-49 of Eyer). In view of this fact, it

Art Unit: 2614

would accordingly have been obvious to delete the analog channel of Kim when the digital channel is in a reception state, thereby providing the better of the two. Furthermore, when the state of reception indicates that the digital channel is not occurring, deletion thereof is disclosed by Kim as discussed above, thereby meeting claim 6 (and essentially claim 9).

As for claims 7 and 10, automatic scanning is carried out (e.g. col. 2 line 51-59)

As for claims 8 and 11, the channel table includes both analog and digital channels (Fig. 5A or 5B).

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Victor R. Kostak whose telephone number is 703 305-4374. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 6:30am-3:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Miller can be reached on 703 305-4795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this final action should be mailed to:

Art Unit: 2614

Box AF

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 308-HELP.

4. 4.60

Victor R. Kostak Primary Examiner Art Unit 2614

VRK